P.F. 97894

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1894-95

192

(R)

File No. 13294

Serial Nos. 1—8

Later references.
LR 5747-02

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—8

Major ~~Part~~ B for August 1895

SUBJECT.

Petition of Chikkagoudappa and others regarding the Boundary of Karchelli Devanahalli Taluk.

WD 2232—GPP—20,000—11-6-20

Countersigned
Major

(8)

Appeal No 106 of 1894-95

Appellants.

1. Chikka Gonindappa
2. Ramanna
3. Srinivasappa

Respondents.

1. Doddi Gonindappa
2. Gurappa
3. Nandimanta Rao

and others.

Dispute relating to the Shanbhogi of Karahalli and other villages in the Devanahalli Taluk.

List of papers.

(1) Dy Comm's order
(2) Official Memorandum
(3) & (4) Appeal petitions
(5) Dy Comm's order
(6) Assistant Comm's judgment
(7) First appeal Asstt Comm's Memo, and with the Dy Comm's two letters, 5 pieces
(8) Genealogical Table.
(9) Exhibit D, produced by the Appellants with the appeal petition
(10) Judge's notes

Received on the 11th day of Nov 1895

Docket-drafted 12/11 SV

2.

The D.C. Commissioners does
not seem to be quite sure
he was not quite sure
whether all the allegations
formed are changed or more
Now that this fact has
been ascertained and
there could only be one
Shamboyne these papers
will be sent back to the
D.C. Court who will after
hearing the parties and
making the necessary
investigation about
the most eligible man
to do the duties of Shamboyne.

8/8/95

Mild.

Genealogical Table (Exh. No II)

Govindappa.

- Venkatanayappa (Dismissed & deceased)
  - (1st Defdt) Dodda Govindappa (Living. Dismissed)
    - Timmappa (4th Defdt)
    - Nanjunda
    - Venkatarama (6th Defdt)
  - Kariyappa (given away in adoption)
  - (2nd Defdt) Giriyappa (barred (1))
  - (3rd Defdt) Hanumanta Rao (Dismissed in Chikballapur Talk)
- Krishnappa (deceased - no issue)
- Ramappa (deceased - no issue)
- Lakshmipataiya (deceased)
  - (1st Pltff) Chikka Govindappa Rejoinder (Dismissed 4 years ago)
    - Srinivasaiya (12 years old)
    - Lakshmipataiya (1½ years old)
  - (2nd Pltff) Ramaswami (Held the Shanbhogi in Khana & Nandana but as he did not do the work properly, he was dismissed & Giriyappa Shanbhog of Kundana was appointed)
  - (3rd Pltff) Ramaiya

(8)

appeals [illegible]
the D of Comm[illegible] in Inglish.

13/12/94

The grounds of appeal are—

1 The defendants have no
regard to the Marhalee circle
Shanbogue of [illegible] as some of
villages fell to their share
at the partition of their
ancestors.

(2) That Chickkapirindappa
is not found fault with
in respect of the shanbogue
[illegible]

Gen. Serial No. 32.] 1895

No. 1929.

Name of Petitioner: [illegible]

Village. Karkatti and [illegible]

Taluk. Dharwar

Dist. Dharwar

Date of Appl. 23-1-95.

Date of Receipt. 23-1-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. [illegible]

ABSTRACT.

With reference to the Judgment in
1922 of 12-9-94 Lieutenant [illegible]
appeal petition with additional stamp
appeal papers copies with the petition
and copy of the decree appealed
against.

28/1. Council case
Submit to Hon Council.
[illegible]
23/1.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1622 of 1894

dated 23-1-95, received at the

Dewan's Office from [illegible]

is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the [illegible]

By Order,

Bangalore, 11-3-1895

for Chief Secretary.

M.G.C.P.Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.



1622

COURT FEE

TWO RUPEES

MYSORE DEVELOPMENT
PETITION DEPARTMENT

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

189

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

No.

Draft for approval.

(6)

To

The Deputy Commr

Bangalore District

No. 23332 / Pay 27-94 Dt. 11.6.95.

13

With docket No. 1264 dated 22nd April 95, submitting the records connected with the appeal of Chikka Lingappa and others of Kanakalli, Devanhalli Taluk.

L.R. 132-94-5

With reference to the above, have the honour to request that the Deputy Commr will be good as to report whether the marginally noted four villages in the North North East Devanhalli Taluk constitute one or more charges

1. Kanakalli
2. Kanakallikere
3. Ramasettanahalli
4. Hirayanahalli.

By Order

Draft
Considered

Revenue Secretary.

SC 12/6.

13/6

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

189

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

No.

Draft for approval.

(3)

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

1894-95.

OFFICE OF THE
8209
25 JUN 1895
Q 5765
DIWAN OF MYSORE

From The Dy Commissioner
C.T.74.
Bangalore District

To The Secretary to the Revenue Govt
of Mysore.

Dated 25th June 1894

Despatched Do

Received

Enclosures—No.

General No.
No. 1578.

Re Hoti
28/6/95

To be transf'd to the Revn Dept
29/6/95

R. 132-94-6

5/6

1. Karahally.
2. Karahalli Kere.
3. Kempatimmanhally.
and
4. Misaganahally.

The Revenue Secretary's
No. 23332 dated 11th Instant,
P.797-94.
requesting to report whether
the marginally noted
villages constitute one
Shanbhogi charge.

Has the honor to
submit that the villages
in question form one
charge with a Potage
of Rs 99-

For Dy Commissioner

5/7/95

(9)

15

Proceedings of the Court of Bangalore

Read:—

(1) Petition No 1622/R.S.106, dated 8th December 1894, presented by Chikka Gowdappa and others of Kavalalli, Devanhalli Taluk, appealing against the order of the District Court of Bangalore, dated 3rd December 1894, in Rev. Appeal No 1 of 94-95, regarding the Shanbhogi of Kavalalli and 3 other villages in the Devanhalli Taluk.

(2) Proceedings received with the Bangalore District Court's Communication docket No. 1264 dated 22nd April 95.

(3) Correspondence ending

f. R. 132-94-7

17

investigation, appoint the most eligible man to do the duties of Shanbhog.

Draft

HCh
5/8

C 2+3.

for Revenue Secretary.

To

The Deputy Commr
Bangalore District
with records.

S.V.
12/8.

with the Copy dated 5.8.95 dated 28th June 1895 from the Deputy Commr of Bangalore reporting that the 4 villages in question form one charge.

— u —

Order thereon No. 1958 / P.F.97-94 dy 15/20.8.95

The Deputy Commissioner's order does not appear to be final. He has not given any decision whether all the villages formed one charge or more. It is for him first to have this fact ascertained, and then could do only the necessary, then papers will be sent back to the Deputy Commissioner who will after hearing the parties and making the necessary

18

[illegible] 1622/A.S.106

(8) (10)

L.R.132-94

[illegible]

[illegible] 1894 [illegible]

[illegible]

1622/A.S.106 [illegible]

[illegible]

Draft-

By Order

18/8

for Revenue Secretary.

12/8

20-8-95